

**REMARKS**

The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amendment and the following remarks. Support for newly added claims 42 and 43 can be found in claims 11 and 27 respectively. The applicant has amended the bridge in formula II in claims 34, 38 and 40, so that an aromatic or heteroaromatic ring system is not one of the possibilities for the bridge. Claim 43 requires that the bridge in FORMULA (LIX), is not an aromatic or heteroaromatic ring system. The applicant has amended the claims to redraft the claims into better form. No new matter has been added. A fee of \$104.00 is enclosed for the extra two claims that were added.

Claims 2, 8-14, 22, 24, 38, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 2, 8, 10-14, 22, 24, 34, 38, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2004/0062930 (Roberts et al.). Claims 2, 8, 10-14, 22, 24, 34, 38, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. in view of US 6,670,054 (Hu et al.). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. in view of WO 03/074628 (Maxted et al.). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. in view of US 6,670,054 (Hu et al.) and further in view of Maxted et al. The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

**35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection**

Claims 2, 8-14, 22, 24, 38, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The applicant has amended claims 38, 40 and 41 and believes that these claims as amended are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. For The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

**Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 2, 8, 10-14, 22, 24, 34, 38, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Roberts. Claims 2, 8, 10-14, 22, 24, 34, 38, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts in view of Hu. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts in view of Maxted. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts in view of Hu and further in view of Maxted.

All the rejections are based upon the primary reference of Roberts. The applicant has four independent claims (claims 27 (withdrawn), 34, 38, and 40). According to independent claim 38, a mixture is claimed comprising:

- (A) at least one conjugated polymer wherein the at least one conjugated polymer comprises one or more units of the formula (1),
- (B) at least one bridged carbazole unit which comprises at least one compound of the formula (II) and
- (C) at least one triplet emitter.

Independent claims 34, 38 and 40 require that the R" with respect to formula (II) is the same or different at each instance and is a straight-chain, branched or cyclic alkylene chain which has from 1 to 40 carbon atoms and is optionally R1-substituted or unsubstituted, in which one or more nonadjacent carbon atoms is optionally replaced by -NR2-, -O-, -S-, -CO-, -CO-O-, -CO-NR2-, -O-O-O-, an R1-substituted or unsubstituted vinylene unit or an acetylene unit, the possible substituents R1 may optionally be situated at any free position." In other words, the independent claims require that the carbazole compounds of formula (II) have the two carbazole groups bridged with an alkylene group, a vinylene group or an acetylene group. This is not taught by Roberts or Hu.

Again, the cited prior art (Roberts and Hu) disclose only bridged carbazole compounds having aromatic or heteroaromatic ring systems as bridge not the applicant's claimed bridge. For the above reasons, these rejections should be withdrawn.

In view of the above response, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

A fee of \$104.00 is enclosed for the extra two claims that were added. Applicant believes no additional fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 14113-00033-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: November 30, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Ashley I. Pezzner/  
Ashley I. Pezzner  
Registration No.: 35,646  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1007 North Orange Street  
P. O. Box 2207  
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-2207  
(302) 658-9141; (302) 658-5614 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant